

Point—Counterpoint

General

Point—Counterpoint provides an opportunity for those involved in professional aviation training or testing research to exchange information, following a scholarly debate format to be explained later under the Instructions heading. Whereas scholarly manuscripts undergo a Blind Review process, conducted by persons within the same area of interest as that expressed in the manuscript, Point—Counterpoint preserves the peer review process, but welcomes an Open Review, where scholars and practitioners can discuss the pros and cons of theory, method, or practice in an open forum. The editor-in-chief of the journal will review all abstracts and manuscripts destined for this area of this journal, to ensure that the format, the tone, and the content meet this journal’s quality objectives. Since an Open Review puts at risk the person initiating the debate, as the editor-in-chief I will ensure that only the subject, not the individual is critiqued.

Instructions

Suggesting a Subject

As the editor of this journal I welcome any recommendations for scholarly debate. You need only send me the topic and a brief abstract of your vision in an e-mail note. I will review the abstract and if accepted I’ll contact my colleagues (U.S. and worldwide) and ask them to write position papers on the topic.

Submitting an Initial Position on a Subject

As the editor I will contact persons who publish or present on issues connected with the suggested subject. I will ask these persons to present an abstract on the subject. Based on the worth of the abstract and its focus on the essence of the suggested subject, I will select one or more persons to write position papers.

What is a position paper?

A position paper is a concise treatment of a theory, method, idea, or any other cognitive form of inquiry. The paper starts with an abstract, followed by several pages describing the topic. I encourage you to use the following headings:

Continued on next page...

Title of Paper (centered, all caps)

Abstract (on a separate page)

The Focus of the Debate (centered, sentence case)

My Position on the Subject (centered, sentence case)

What Others Say (centered, sentence case)

My Recommendations (centered, sentence case)

Reference List (on a separate page, left margin)

Biographical Sketch (left margin, no more than 5 lines)

Name

Position (rank, job title)

Institution (organization, company, etc)

Areas of interest in which you are involved

Font, Front Size

MS Reference Sans Serif, at 11 pt.

What to Focus on for an Open Review of the Manuscripts

Focus of the Debate

This section is purely your view of the subject, without justification from outside sources. You will have an opportunity to show support for your view in the section named What Others Say.

As you understand it, how would you describe or define the subject? Ensure that the named subject is not confused with similar subjects. If operational definitions are necessary, provide them.

My Position on the Subject

This section is also just your view, without outside justification or support for your view. As concisely as possible, state your position. Do not mention persons of alternative view. You can mention persons holding opposing views in the section What Others Say. Express your position in a logical format, where assertions logically follow other assertions.

What Others Say

This section does not express your view, but rather guides the reader to those sources that either agree with or disagree with

your view. Contain your sources to no more than 20. I am not interested in an all inclusive list of supporters. Use sources as tools to support your view or to state those views that are noticeably different from yours. Do not restate your view in this section. You've already stated it in the preceding sections. Your sentences should start with an author's name, followed by the date of the publication in which this author's views reside, followed by what that author has written on the subject.

For example,

Dekker (2005) did not completely agree with Reason (1999) on the theoretical underpinnings of the causal link between the human and the machine where errors were present. He illustrated his disagreement with the Cartesian-Newtonian view of human error by using a Venn diagram, in which only human error and machine malfunction were actors.

Do not write, or try to avoid the following:

Not everyone agrees with the theoretical underpinnings of human error (Dekker, 2005; Reason, 1999).

In the latter example (Do not write), one cannot be certain that the author properly interpreted either Dekker or Reason. The former example makes Dekker's contribution stand out as his opinion or view and not just your interpretation of his opinion or view. Dekker is welcomed to the scholarly debate through you. Display his schooled view, as well as others.

My Recommendations

This section is a fusion of the first two sections and the third section: two instances where your view is featured and one instance where many other views are featured. In your recommendations, guide the reader to further study of the subject, along the lines you've already described in the preceding sections. Put yourself in the place of the teacher guiding his/her students toward the true path. If you've done your homework, the reader will find your views convincing.

If you have questions about this format, please send me a note at todd.hubbard@okstate.edu

Todd P. Hubbard EdD, LtCol USAF (Ret)
Editor-in-Chief, *International Journal of Professional Aviation Training & Testing Research*
Mobile: 405-474-5199